DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 474 238 CE 084 673

AUTHOR	Squillaci, Christine M.; Russ-Eft, Darlene F.; Hatcher, Timothy G.; Rocco, Tonette S.; Yang, Baiyin
TITLE	Recruiting and Developing HRDQ Reviewers: Why You Should Do It and What You Should Look For. Innovative Session.
REPORT NO	No-5
PUB DATE	2002-00-00
NOTE	5p.; In: Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) Conference Proceedings (Honolulu, Hawaii, February 27-March 3, 2002); see CE 084 635.
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Discourse; *Editors; *Educational Research; *Labor Force Development; Quality Control; *Recruitment; Research and Development; *Scholarly Journals
IDENTIFIERS	Academy of Human Resource Development; Association Magazines; *Human Resource Development Quarterly; Professional Journals; Professional Literature; *Reviewers

ABSTRACT

The recruitment and development of reviewers for the Academy of Human Resource Development's (AHRD) research journal, "Human Resources Development Quarterly" (HRDQ), was examined at an innovative session of the 2002 AHRD conference. The session was conducted by five members of HRDQ's editorial board. The session objectives were as follows: (1) provide background on HRDQ's content and role in the HRD community; (2) introduce selected members of the editorial board and their relevant roles; (3) allow key members of the editorial board to present what is important in a review; (4) explain the review process and its importance; (5) clarify the existing process and its rationale; (6) offer examples of good and bad reviews and ways of improving reviews; (7) encourage members of both academic and professional arenas to consider the opportunity of becoming an HRDQ reviewer; (8) facilitate a question-and-answer or discussion period; and (9) provide potential reviewers with the HRDQ's general guidelines for manuscript review and the name of a person to contact regarding becoming a reviewer. The innovative session included an introduction to HRDQ, a panel discussion of reviewers' roles and responsibilities, small group discussions of the principles of good reviews, presentation and discussion of the small groups' suggestions, and a wrap-up session. (Contains 8 references) (MN)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 474 238

2002 AHRD Conference

Innovative Session 5

Honolulu, Hawaii

February 27 - March 3, 2002

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
C. Squillaci
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

2

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE084673

Recruiting and Developing *HRDQ* Reviewers: Why You Should Do It and What You Should Look For

Christine M. Squillaci
San Jose State University

Darlene F. Russ-Eft
American Institutes for Research

Timothy G. Hatcher
University of Louisville

Tonette S. Rocco
Florida International University

Baiyin Yang
University of Minnesota

The purpose of this innovative session is to recruit and develop reviewers for AHRD's research journal, Human Resources Development Quarterly (HRDQ). It will also serve as a refresher for current reviewers on what the process is and provide an opportunity for questions and/or comments about the review process.

Keywords: Peer Evaluation, Editorial Review

The need for talented manuscript reviewers is something that is always of importance and is especially important to the Editors of *Human Resources Development Quarterly (HRDQ)*. While *HRDQ* offers much to the Human Resource Development field, good quality reviewers can add even more by utilizing their expertise in the review of manuscripts submitted for publication. In order to bring the field forward and to have the journal cited more frequently, we need individuals from not only universities, but corporations as well. These two areas combined add to the value of our journal being applied in more areas and as a forerunner in research-to-practice literature. The notion of using both researcher and practitioner to review manuscripts has been suggested as having significance to the review process itself (Campion, 1993a).

Epstein (1995) proposed 10 guidelines to improve the journal review process. While these guidelines can be useful, some are not practical to the *HRDQ* review process. One of Epstein's (1995) suggestions was to reveal the identity of the reviewer to the author. This was met with more resistance than agreement (Fine, 1996; Rabinovich, 1996). The current system of blind review used by *HRDQ* may allow for more truthful reviews, although the argument could be made otherwise. Others (Cowen, Spinell, Hightower, & Lotyczewski, 1987) question the validity and reliability of the review process itself. While our goal is not to change the current review process or to debate its relative value, we do intend to educate potential reviewers and explain why the current method is used.

It should be clarified that the review process is not a place for reviewers to take out their aggressions on authors nor to focus on the negative, which has on occasion appeared to be the case (Fiske & Fogg, 1990; Levinson, 1996). Instead, the review process should provide constructive criticism and suggestions for improvement in addition to any negative critique (Bedeian, 1996; Rabinovich, 1996). Each manuscript does have some merit and should be respected by the reviewers and the editors. That said, reviewers and editors need to be aware of any biases they may have and have a way to manage them (Epstein, 1995). Manuscript review and journal publication is a way to further expand the Human Resource Development field and spark more research and even debate into it.

Session Description

The proposed session will address these issues among others. It will serve as a forum of how to review an article and what constitutes a quality review versus a weak review. It will offer potential reviewers and any current reviewers an opportunity to ask the Editorial Board questions and allow them to gain further insight about the review process. Issues such as why we review manuscripts, how the process works, how one does it and what is

Copyright © 2002 Christine M. Squillaci, Darlene F. Russ-Eft, Timothy G. Hatcher, Tonette S. Rocco, Baiyin Yang

required of them, why academic and corporate reviewers are needed, and others that surround the review process will be addressed and clarified. Suggestions for improvements may be discussed including the pros and cons of the authors reviewing the reviewers. Most importantly, the value that an individual brings as a reviewer will be discussed and how that value adds to the greater good of the Human Resource Development field.

Presenters and Panelists

Five members of the *HRDQ* Editorial Board will conduct the innovative session, one of who will act as the moderator and facilitator for the audience. All members will discuss what reviewers should look for when reviewing a manuscript. More specifically, the Managing Editor will discuss the manuscript review process. The Editor and Associate Editor will discuss what the merits are for being a reviewer and why individuals from both the academic and practitioner worlds should consider the opportunity to contribute as a reviewer. To further develop reviewers, both the Qualitative and Quantitative Method Editors will discuss the methodologies often used to refresh potential reviewers and offer other relevant suggestions.

Session Objectives

In order to recruit and develop *HRDQ* reviewers, the innovative session will offer a 'developmental session' followed by a question and answer or discussion period to expose new and current reviewers on how to review a manuscript. The session will achieve this by completing the following goals:

- Give a background on what *HRDQ* is and does for the HRD community
- Introduce selected members of the Editorial Board and their relevant roles
- Allow key members of the Editorial Board to present what is important in a review
- Explain the role of the reviewer and its importance
- Elucidate the process that is in place and why this process is used
- Offer examples of 'good' versus 'bad' reviews, what can be done to improve them, and what constitutes valuable feedback
- Encourage members of both the academic and professional arenas to consider this opportunity and the advantages of doing so
- Facilitate a question and answer or discussion period
- Provide potential reviewers the General Guidelines for manuscript review and who they contact should they decide to pursue the opportunity

Session Structure

The session will be broken down into five sections as follows.

1. Introduction of what *HRDQ* is, how it contributes to the HRD community and brief introductions of select members of the *HRDQ* Editorial Board and their relevant roles and responsibilities. (Length: *15 minutes*)
2. Panel discussion of the reviewer's role and responsibilities, the current process that is used and some important aspects in a review. (Length: *15 minutes*)
3. Small group discussion: distribute examples of good and bad reviews; develop basic principles of what constitutes a good or bad review. (Length: *30 minutes*)
4. Presentation and discussion of small group suggestions. (Length: *20 minutes*)
5. Wrap up and further encourage audience members to consider the opportunity to become a reviewer; distribution of General Guidelines for manuscript review and contact information. (Length: *10 minutes*)

Contribution

The innovative session is planned so participants will receive a background of *HRDQ* and the manuscript review process. Participants will hear from active Editorial Board members about why the review process is important and what they can do to further add value. The format has been designed so enough information is presented as to facilitate a potential reviewer into making a well-informed decision by the end of the session.

References

Bedeian, A. G. (1996). Improving the journal review process: The question of ghostwriting. *American Psychologist, 51*, (11), 1189.

Campion, M. A. (1993a). Are there differences between reviewers on the criteria they use to evaluate research articles? *The Industrial-Organizational Psychologist, 31*, (2), 29-39.

Cowen, E. L., Spinell, A., Hightower, A. D., & Lotyczewski, B. S. (1987). *American Psychologist, 42*, (4), 403-405.

Epstein, S. (1995). What can be done to improve the journal review process. *American Psychologist, 50*, (10), 883-885.

Fine, M. A. (1996). Reflections on enhancing accountability in the peer review process. *American Psychologist, 51*, (11), 1190-1191.

Fiske, D. W. & Fogg, L. (1990). But the reviewers are making different criticisms of my paper! Diversity and uniqueness in reviewer comments. *American Psychologist, 45*, (5), 591-598.

Levinson, R. L. (1996). Enhance the journals, not the review process. *American Psychologist, 51*, (1), 1191-1193.

Rabinovich, B. A. (1996). A perspective on the journal review process. *American Psychologist, 51*, (11), 1190.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: 2002 AHRD Conference Proceedings	
Author(s): Toby marshall Egan & Susan A. Lynham	
Corporate Source: Academy of Human Resource Development	Publication Date: February 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Kathryn S. Egan

Printed Name/Position/Title:

Organization/Address: Academy of Human Resource Development
College of Technology
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403-0301

Telephone: 419.372.9155 FAX: 419.372.8385

E-Mail Address: office@ahrd.org Date: 2-28-03

(over)

09/12/2003 08:27 FAX 6142921260 OSU CTR EDUC & TRNG EMPL 002

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Acquisitions Coordinator
ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education
Center on Education and Training for Employment
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1090

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

09/12/2003 08:27 FAX 6142921260 OSU CTR EDUC & TRNG EMPL 003